

AA - Metals Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date:

Auditor:

Laboratory:

rev. 8/05

Hard Copy Data Review	Yes	No	Comments
<u>Proficiency Samples:</u>			
1. Report or Analysis date:			
2. PE successful?			
<u>Calibration:</u>			
1. Standard Information (vendor and lot)			
-Analysis date:			
-Analyst:			
-Instrument ID:			
-Software type:			
-File names:			
2. Quantitation Report Review			
-Does the lab have adequate hard copy data (absorbance counts)?			
-Are all standards run the same day/batch? (Check Acquired Times)			
-Is the method update time (if applicable) the same for each?			
-Does the standards have the proper sensitivity?			
-No significant contamination?			
-Do the calibration levels support the laboratory's reporting levels (check cal. level vs. final report of sample vs. MDLs)? For DW must have a RL check standard or a standard at the RL, but calibration only requires a blank and one std.			

Date: Auditor: rev. 8/05
Laboratory:

Auditor:

rev. 8/05

3. Calibration Method Information			
-Quantitation method file name (if applicable):			
-Calibration type (i.e. linear, quadratic, etc.):			
-Same for all compounds?			
-Was the calibration criteria specified in the laboratory SOP met for each compound?			
-Was the LDR/IEC study results reviewed and done at the appropriate frequency?			
-Were data points eliminated from the calibration if a multi-point curve was used?			
-If yes, why?			
-Was this done appropriately?			
<i>Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern</i>			
<u>Sample Information:</u>			
-Sample date/time(from COC):			
-Were the samples properly preserved (pH < 2, except soils)?			
<u>Sample Preparation Procedures:</u>			
-Extraction method: Or Turbidity < 1.0 NTU documented?			
-Extraction date/time:			
-Did the sample meet the extraction hold time?			
-Is the extraction documentation correct and complete? Acids used and temperature documentation needed			
-Was the extraction acceptable (refer to check sheets or hand notes)?			

rev. 8/05

Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern

Sample Analysis:

-Sample ID:

-Analysis date/time:

-Was the sample hold time met? (6 mo. & 28 for HG)

-Was the proper QC run with the sample batch?

-Was the QC at the proper concentrations?

-Was the appropriate QC criteria met?

-Are all QC checks within the calibration range of the instrument?

-Does the hard copy data correspond to the run log?

-Are there any major breaks in the acquisition times?

-Do all the samples/QC in the batch have the same method file/update time (if applicable)?

-No significant contamination or matrix interference?

-Do the analytical results on the Quant Report match those on the final report?

Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern

Laboratory Review

Yes

No

Comments

-Was the analyst(s) available for interviewing?

-Did the analyst(s) provide adequate response to the concerns found from the hard copy data review?

-Was the analyst(s) following proper procedure?

AA - Metals Data Auditing Check Sheet			
Date:	Auditor:		
Laboratory:	rev. 8/05		
-If no, see notes or check sheets. -If no, is SOP correct? -If no, is the QAP correct?			
-Did the lab have the proper equipment and instrumentation (background correction and lamps)?			
-Did the lab have the proper reagents?			
-Did the lab have adequate documentation such as run logs, maintenance logs, temperature logs and standard logs?			
<u>Electronic Data Review:</u>	Yes	No	Comments
<u>In-Lab Review:</u>			
1. High and low standard			
-Does the low standard (or MRL check) have acceptable sensitivity			
-check calibration plots and correlation if not available with hard copy			
-check maintenance log.			
2. Initial CCV			
-Can the laboratory reprint a Quant Report that matches the hard copy?			
-If yes, Attach.			
-If no, why?			
3. Other electronic data concerns (Identified in the hard copy review):			

AA - Metals Data Auditing Check Sheet

Date:

Auditor:

Laboratory:

rev. 8/05

<i>Attach photo copy documentation of any areas of concern</i>			
<u>Training:</u> -If significant problems are noted above, do the analyst's training files show that they were properly trained?			